REMARKS

Claims 1-57 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 20, 30, 39, and 49 are independent claims. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Barry et al. (US 6,615,258). The drawings have been objected to by the Examiner.

Regarding Drawing Objection

As noted by the Examiner, the description on page 7, referred to incorrect reference numerals. The specification has been amended and formal drawings are being filed with this Reply.

Acceptance is respectfully requested.

Regarding Rejections

The rejections of Claims 1-57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are traversed. Although claims have been amended, those amendments correct clerical errors. In addition, new claims have been added to the application.

Briefly, the Applicants describe a distributed computing system that facilitates message routing from a process to a user interface. The message technique is useful for both dialog and error reporting.

As claimed, a client is connected to a master node of a cluster. A message list on the master node is then associated with the client. As tasks for the client are performed on cluster nodes, events can be detected. Once detected, a message descriptive of the event is stored on the message list and communicated to the client.

In particular, the client interfaces with the master node through a distributed object on the master node. This distributed object (called a console) provides a synchronous call interface that does not use any network semantics, and can therefore be used by all layers of software. The console can further include an error stack, which can be maintained on a per client context basis.

Barry discusses a web-based data management system. In particular, Barry focuses on customer interface. The overall user interface system is controlled and managed by an application backplane unit. In addition, each remote service includes its own user interface unit.

OID-2000-048-01

As claimed by the Applicants in all independent claims, a cluster of computing nodes is required. Barry, in contrast, is unrelated to clusters. The only cluster discussed by Barry is a web server cluster (24), which is preferred but not required by Barry. (*See* col. 59, ll. 55-56).

The Applicants claim a client connected to a <u>master node</u> of a cluster. A review of Figure 2 and column 7, lines 29-57 of Barry fails to disclose the claimed limitation. The cited passage discusses the web server cluster and client tier software. Barry does not disclose a client connected to a <u>master node</u> of the cluster.

The Applicants also claim a message list on the master node that is associated with the client. Column 18, lines 17-66, discusses communications between an Order Entry (OE) client application and an OE server, which is not part of the web server cluster. There is no discussion of a message list on a master node. Nor does Barry store messages on the message list that are descriptive of a detected event.

Furthermore, Claims 11, 30, and 49 recite additional limitations. For example, these claims recite a distributed object on the master node, through which messages are communicated to the client. Column 8, lines 12-57 of Barry discusses logon validation and the tracking of logical sessions via cookies. It does not discuss a distributed object on a master node for communicating with a client.

The dependent claims recite additional patentable subject matter. In any event, the allowance of the dependent claims follow from allowance of the independent claims.

Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By

Rodney D. Johnson
Registration No. 36,558
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: May 10, 2004